

## REMARKS

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner alleges that there is no support in the specification for the feature that “only one layer of the material laid on top of an entirety of said annular diffused region.” The Examiner further indicates that it is allegedly clear, for example, from Fig.10 that layer 39, layer 20b, and part of layer 20a sit on top of annular diffused region 21.


The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s analysis.

As defined by claim 1, the annular diffused region is disposed between the first annular isolation trench and the annular isolation trench. Layers 20a and 20b, allegedly sitting on top of the annular diffused region 21, are actually the first annular isolation trench 20a and second annular isolation trench 20b, (specification, page 13, lines 15-18). Annular diffused region 21, by definition of claim 1, is between the first annular isolation trench 20a and the second annular isolation trench 20b and, thus, these layers cannot be said to be on top of the annular diffused region 21. Layer 39 thus is the only layer on top of the entirety of annular diffused region 21, (see Fig. 10; page 15, lines 9-13).

In addition, as previously stated in the Amendment filed herein on May 19, 2003, the above-mentioned feature in claim 1 is supported by, for example, page 21, lines 19-24, of the specification, (Amendment, page 4, lines 8-10).

Any fee due with this paper, not fully covered by an enclosed check, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael I. Markowitz  
Reg. No. 30,659

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN  
575 MADISON AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022  
(212) 940-8687  
DOCKET NO.:NECN 17.893  
MIM:rm:NECN17893-4  
**CUSTOMER NO.: 026304**